

Date: Thu, 25 Nov 93 04:30:10 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #485  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Thu, 25 Nov 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 485

Today's Topics:

Code teaching program ?  
Free societies (was: No Code)  
No Code etc... (3 msgs)  
type specified radios  
Use of HT for Marine & GMRS  
Why isn't Amateur Radio like CB?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Wed, 24 Nov 1993 19:56:40 GMT  
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!pineapp@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: Code teaching program ?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2d06g6\$fka@agate.berkeley.edu> ron@etch-eshop.Berkeley.EDU (Ronald Viegelaahn) writes:

>  
>  
> Does anyone know of a MSDOS computer program available that  
>helps teach morse code ?  
>  
> I'm not currently into amateur radio,but I just can't help  
>but think that someone has written such software.  
>  
> Perhaps something that would use a single key as a keyer and  
>also ask you to randomly enter the proper dit da sequence for

>text and etc.  
>  
> Ron V  
>  
> ron@etcheshop.Berkeley.EDU  
>

Check in oak.oakland.edu /pub/msdos/hamradio for a file name sm404.zip.

--

INTERNET: pineapp@netcom.com	Daniel Curry WB6STW
AMPRNET : dan@wb6stw.ampr.org [44.4.20.144]	E:-) Ham Radio Operator
AX.25 : wb6stw@n0ary.#NOCAL.CA.USA.NA	Redwood City, CA USA

Date: 25 Nov 93 10:59:32 GMT  
From: brunix!doorknob!sds@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Free societies (was: No Code)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Whoa, folks, let's all calm down. The point here is HF no-code, etc. I hadn't heard about any push in this regard until picking r.r.a.[mp] back up. I must say, it's an intriguing idea. I certainly would love to have 80m phone privs. I participated in Field Day this summer and got to work 20, 40, and 80 phone, and I *\*loved\** it. The no-code HF would allow me to get on the air in those bands immediately.

For me, there's a dual issue. (a) what's the point? In both of my living environments, a 20-80m antenna is both prohibitive and prohibited. (Dorms and apartments -- joy.) 20-80m gear tends to expensive, and all the stuff I've ever built has always been very inaccurate and intolerant -- and building a transmitter is *\*way\** harder than a receiver. (Yes, I know I *\*should\** know how to build a superhet-based xceiver cold. In a way, we all should. But I don't, and I have too many other courses right now to spend a lot of time on analog electronic and radiocommunication theory projects/courses/etc.) and (b) there *\*is\** a point to code. Granted, it may be evolving into a special-case, as digital mode is right now (no flames please! I'm only talking from usage statistics), but it has its own advantages as well as disadvantages. One example is that the equipment is simpler to build or homebrew in an serious emergency (large earthquake, transportation failure, etc.) -- a factor that is *\*very\** important to me as an amateur operator.

The long and short of it? I'm wishy-washy. Knowing code makes us more valuable in an emergency, but isn't necessary in every case, nor to enjoy or healthily expand the hobby. As long as we teach each other (and, especially, new licensees) proper form and procedure, what's wrong with allowing people on the air without a code requirement? And even if you ripped all the code out from ham radio, I'd *\*still\** be hard pressed to pass that Advanced written without a good deal of theory education and preparation.

I can't see *\*why\** my .edu would bother anybody or make them take my posts less seriously, but if you do, please feel free to imagine they come from a .com or .gov site, as I exist in those domains as well.

Scott Swanson - scott\_swanson@brown.edu - n9sat

-----  
Date: Tue, 23 Nov 1993 14:40:24 GMT  
From: brunix!maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: No Code etc...  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

rcrw90@email.mot.com (Mike Waters) writes:

> The treaty requirement really is a red herring, as has been pointed out  
> before. We either take an "exception" to the treaty as the Japanese and a  
> few others have done or we work around it in some way.

The "Japanese no-code HF" argument is in fact a red-herring, since the current CB Radio service is very similar to the Japanese no-code HF license. The only difference is that the Japanese call their CB radio operators "amateurs" and license them, whereas we don't.

MD

--  
-- Michael P. Deignan  
-- Population Studies & Training Center  
-- Brown University, Box 1916, Providence, RI 02912  
-- (401) 863-7284  
-----

Date: Fri, 19 Nov 1993 15:39:49 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!news.moneng.mei.com!uwm.edu!  
linac!att!cbnewsm!jeffj@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: No Code etc...  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Nov19.142653.11334@cs.brown.edu> md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu  
(Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>Ed Eilers <EDELERS@delphi.com> writes:

>

>> No, as I have said OVER AND OVER that is NOT acceptable -- knowledge of Morse  
>> Code is NOT RELEVANT to the use of phone. The fact that you're advocating  
>> requiring Morse in order to use phone shows clearly that you simply want to  
>> use Morse Code as a barrier to entry, NOT as a test of relevant skills.

Good try but on the wrong tack. It is a test of relevant skills as it  
is in wide usage on the ham bands. As much as the anti-code groups  
try to spread the myth that it isn't, it is the second major mode  
after SSB. So it is very relevant until CW ceases to be the second  
major mode after SSB.

>The facts of the matter are as follows: there are two levels of thought in  
>amateur radio. There are the people who want to eliminate the code  
>entirely, and there are the people who want to keep the code requirement.

>

>My proposal is a happy medium. It maintains the code requirement, while  
>reducing the code requirement from 13/20wpm for access to other sections  
>of HF spectrum. The 8wpm code requirement is slightly higher than the  
>current 5wpm level, since we want to test for a 'conversational' usage of  
>8 is sufficiently low that it tests for comprehension, yet does not  
>make amateurs run into that frustrating 10wpm "code barrier" which

This should be the next step that Amateur Radio should go to. As least  
give new hams exposure to the SECOND MAJOR MODE after SSB.

>> I submit that this is entirely the wrong attitude to take in a free society.

>

>1. This isn't a free society.

>2. Access to the radio spectrum is a privilege, not a right.

In every free society there is some regulation hence drivers licenses,  
no drinking under age of 18, amateur radio license. CB is a good  
example of what no regulation leads to.

Jeff

--

Jeff Jones AB6MB | Vote out those who voted for the North American  
jeffj@seeker.mystic.com | Free Trade Agreement!  
Infolinc BBS 510-778-5929 |

-----

Date: Wed, 24 Nov 1993 19:23:14 GMT  
From: ddsww1!chinet!megabyte@uunet.uu.net

Subject: No Code etc...  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <V7VcDc1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>,  
Robert <robert@amanda.jpunix.com> wrote:  
>If that occurs, Jay, I will leave this hobby forever. I've already  
>abandoned Two Meters as it has degenerated to the point of being another  
>Citizens Band.

Could move here where 2m is still a nice place to chat and even the techs  
without code know about the courtesy beep, check into the nightly NTS net  
and even pass traffic onto to the other NTS 2m net nearby, work hard as  
part of our ARES group, give presentations on packet at club meetings, run  
packet nodes and BBS's, work AMSAT, and VHF,UHF SSB....

Sadly, Robert, I know there are areas where 2m has become as rude and  
unruly as CB. I just consider myself lucky our techs are interested in  
amateur radio, not just in "hey good buddying".

Interestingly enough, not a one of our local techs bitches about the code.  
Either they, like me, pass the code test if they want HF access, or they  
don't worry about code because they enjoy 30Mhz and up with packet, SSB,  
and AMSAT.

--

"It is a pity that even a single drop of this noble  
gift of God should be spilled" - J.S. Bach on wine  
Mark E. Sunderlin: Technocrat in Winchester, VA KD4HRI  
aka Dr. Megabyte: megabyte@chinet.chinet.com (703) 722-9330

-----  
Date: 23 Nov 1993 20:43:21 GMT  
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!  
bradley.bradley.edu!augustana.edu!gganderson@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: type specified radios  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In the United States, are we in the amateur radio category  
the only ones NOT required to use type specified radio  
equipment? Are we the only ones who can build kits or  
homebrew designs as long as they meet emission standards?

Just curious. 73 de Kevin, KB9IUA  
\* \* \* \* \*  
Kevin L. Anderson, Geography Dept., Augustana College  
Rock Island, Illinois 61201 USA phone: (309) 794-7325  
e-mail: gganderson@augustana.edu or kla@helios.augustana.edu  
\* \* \* \* \*

-----  
Date: Tue, 23 Nov 1993 14:36:13 GMT  
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!utnut!  
torn!news.ccs.queensu.ca!venus!pas@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Use of HT for Marine & GMRS  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <22NOV199322034774@erich.triumf.ca>, bennett@erich.triumf.ca  
(P.Bennett) writes:  
|> In article <93326.174137MGB@SLACVM.SLAC.STANFORD.EDU>,  
<MGB@SLACVM.SLAC.STANFORD.EDU> writes...  
|> >I have seen various discussions about using the out of band frequencies  
|> >on a Amateur band tranceiver for Marine, GMRS or other services.  
|> In Canada, and also in the US according to previous discussion on this topic,

BTW: I believe the DOC has been renamed to  
ISC (Industry Science Canada)

trivial, I know.

Peter

Peter A. Stokes \_\_\_\_\_ Voice & Voice mail: (613) 545-2923  
Engineering Applications Support \_\_\_\_\_ FAX: (613) 548-8104  
Canadian Microelectronics Corporation \_\_\_\_\_ Net: pas@jupiter.ic.cmc.ca  
Kingston, Ontario, CANADA \_\_\_\_\_ Radio: VE3ZXT

-----  
Date: 19 Nov 1993 15:43:24 GMT  
From: drt@athena.mit.edu  
Subject: Why isn't Amateur Radio like CB?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Nov18.154754.23881@icaen.uiowa.edu> drenze@icaen.uiowa.edu  
(Douglas J Renze) writes:

Well, I've heard the rumour from a number of truckers that there are enough  
complaints coming in about the Citizens' Band that the FCC is strongly  
considering a petition to reinstate the CB licensing system and charge  
something like \$15-\$30 per yer. Anybody can confirm/deny this? Should  
we, as Amateurs, sponsor a petition like this?

(I guess I, \*as an amateur\*, don't care particularly. How would it  
help us, or hurt us for that matter?)

My real question is this: Will the FCC bother enforcing the Part 95 rules? Catching bootleggers, and such? If not, forget it. Waste of time.

-drt

— —

|David R. Tucker KG2S 8P9CL

drt@mit.edu |

|'Most political sermons teach the congregation nothing except  
|what newspapers are taken at the Rectory.' -C.S. Lewis

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #485

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*